


teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 - 15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Clark and various other patents, in particular, U.S. Patent No.'s: 6,708,161; 6,715,145; 6,609,158; 6,535,913; 6,609,158; and 6,535,913. However, Applicant submits that none of the patents referenced and relied upon in the 103 rejection disclose or suggest any of the claim elements that Applicant has identified (above) as being missing from Clark Clark. Consequently, for the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that none of the claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

For the reasons provided herein, Applicant submits that all of the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed. Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension of time is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN



Nathan P. Elder  
Reg. No. 55,150

Dated: January 20, 2005

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200